



**Bicycle/Pedestrian
Advisory
Committee
of the
Metropolitan
Planning
Organization
for the
Miami Urbanized
Area**

Chairman
Ted Silver

Members
Brett Bibeau

Sheila Boyce

Dr. Barry Burak

Janis Davis

Louis Foster

Susan Kairalla

Amado Leon

Claudia Schmid

Eric Tullberg

Contact Information

David Henderson,
Bicycle/Pedestrian
Coordinator
davidh@miamidade.gov

Miami-Dade MPO
111 NW 1 Street, #910
Miami, Florida 33128

305-375-4507
(fax) 305-375-4950



BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

***NOTE
LOCATION
CHANGE**

**SOUTH MIAMI PUBLIC LIBRARY
6100 SUNSET DRIVE
SOUTH MIAMI, FLORIDA**

***NOTE
LOCATION
CHANGE**

A G E N D A

**MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 2005
AT 7 P.M.**

- I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - MEETING OF JUNE 22, 2005
- III. PRESENTATIONS
 - A. KROME AV. PD&E – O. Gonzalez, FDOT
 - B. TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENTS PROGRAM APPLICATION REVIEW – D. Henderson
- IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS
 - A. HOMESTEAD TRANSPORTATION PLAN – D. Henderson
- V. INFORMATION ITEMS
 - A. LIVABLE COMMUNITIES WORKSHOP – D. Henderson
 - B. M-D PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT UPDATES – J. Cohen, MDPW
 - C. JUNE PROGRESS REPORT – J. Manzella
- VI. MEMBER COMMENTS

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 2005

MEMBERS

PRESENT

Barry Burak
Sheila Boyce
Janis Davis
Louis Foster
Susan Kairalla
Claudia Schmid
Ted Silver
Eric Tullberg
Brett Bibeau

MEMBERS

ABSENT

Amado Leon

OTHERS PRESENT

David Henderson, Staff
Jae Manzella, Staff
Dolce R-Sirgado, MDPW
Harvey Bernstein, MDPW
Ken Jeffries, FDOT
Julio Boucle, URS Corp.
Robert Linares, Metric Eng.
Tom Burton, Everglades Club
Oscar Gonzalez, Media Relations Grp.
Elizabeth Fernandez, FIU student
Kevin Fernandez, Concerned Citizen
Bill Best, Concerned Citizen

The meeting began at 7:07 p.m.

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>DISCUSSION</u>
APPROVAL OF MINUTES	- ET: <i>Motion to approve Minutes of June 22, 2005; seconded by LF; vote – unanimous.</i>
KROME AV. PD&E	<p>- DH: This presentation is regarding a section of Krome Av., different than the section which the BPAC recently discussed regarding the Homestead area.</p> <p>MC: He is the Project Mgr. for the Krome – South Study. This corridor has historically been hazardous. In the 1980's, FDOT proposed 4-lanes, but that was protested against by the community. In the 1990's, FDOT proposed the <u>Krome Av. Action Plan</u>; which the BPAC commented upon, and includes bicycle facilities. Recently, crashes have escalated, and the BCC modified the CDMP to allow widening this regional facility. Besides daily truck traffic, this corridor serves as an alternate evacuation route. <i>The next phase of the study consists of engineering alternatives and socio-environmental analysis, which includes extensive community participation, as well as a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC).</i> The study area is SW 136 – 296 Sts. <i>A public workshop will be held in a few months.</i> There are 5 reasonable alternatives, each of them include bikeways. CAC meetings are being held monthly. Land-use along the corridor is mostly agricultural/commercial. In some areas, ROW is narrow and requires acquiring more; <i>exceptions to typical standards will be requested.</i> Since Krome – North has different land-use and environmental issues, the design may differ from the South area. <i>His PD&E study is planned to be completed by 2006-7; however, final design is planned for 2010-1, due to uncertainties for community consensus. The Krome - North project is planned for final design immediately after the PD&E phase.</i> Vilma Kroft is that Project Mgr. From a bicyclist's standpoint, <i>the Krome – South typical section will include a 12' (two-way, shared-use) path (separated from the roadway by swale) on the southbound side, as well as a 5' dirt trail (to accommodate equestrian use) on the northbound side, (also separated by swale). The roadway itself may be 2 or 3 lanes, and a varied-width median.</i></p> <p>RL: <i>Krome – North will be the same, except they are considering two 6' (one-way) paths.</i></p> <p>TS: Inquired about the process which lead to this design.</p> <p>MC: The Krome Ave. Action Plan (KAAP) was used as a guide. Also, it conforms to the land-use. <i>If the dirt trail is taken out, a path on the northbound side would be included.</i></p> <p>SB: Inquired about a dirt trail in the Krome – North section.</p>

RL: This will not be included; wetland impacts are a major concern.

TS: Inquired as to what considerations are being made regarding recently planned developments to this area, considering the KAAP is several years old.

MC: Data were updated to reflect these proposals. This is one reason the dirt (equestrian) trail may be removed from the project. Up to now, CAC meetings have all focused upon safety; *they will start discussing typical section alternatives.*

TS: Warned that development proposals in the past did not reflect what actually occurred. Inquired if the study team took this into consideration.

JB: The study team had to use the most-recent official projections. *One section will include a passing lane, similar to the US-1 18-mile stretch.*

TS: Inquired if the same safety issues along the 18-mile stretch will occur.

MC: For the southern section, there will be less confrontations, due to traffic patterns. The northern section has more intersections and land-use is different.

TS: Inquired if turn-bays will be provided.

MC: *Each major intersection will have them.* Intersection improvements have already commenced, due to safety concerns.

ET: Referenced the NW 74 Av. project; wherein bike lanes were provided until ROW constraints eliminated them. *It is important to continue provisions for the entire project.*

MC: Both Project Mgrs. are committed to do so.

RL: Concerned that this is a long stretch (14 miles), without rest/water facilities.

TS: Most cyclists using the corridor should be familiar with it, taking necessary preparations. It would be difficult to plan anything for inexperienced cyclists, no matter how short the facility. *It is more important to ensure connectivity to rest/water facilities.*

US-27 (Okeechobee Rd.) is the de-facto roadway for bicycling to/from central Florida.

SB: This will also become a vital resource for recreational riding locally. People will be drawn to this facility, simply because of the landscape.

TS: *Recommended rest stops for people to enjoy the landscape.*

RL: Milton Thompson Pk. is expected to reopen.

TS: The BPAC is open to discuss minimal space alternatives; but, eliminating a facility due to constraints is contentious. *If problems arise in providing bicycle facilities, the Project Mgrs. should discuss them with the BPAC before making a final decision.*

MC: *Each side of the road will have 12' shoulders, 5' of which will be paved.*

DH: Inquired if these could be striped bike lanes.

MC: *During the alternative development process this may be considered.*

RL: Due to high-speeds/truck traffic in the north, he isn't proposing them.

JB: *The northern section will have many more intersections as well.*

JM: If the team concludes that the dirt trail would be removed and another path put in place, *there is still a need to provide a minimum 8' path on one side.* Inquired how tractors would be discouraged from using the non-motorized paths.

JB: Enforcement would be the only option, aside from signage.

JM: Bollards may help.

JB: This isn't being considered, unless the BPAC requests them.

JM: Inquired if landscaping to provide shade would be part of the construction.

JB: The corridor is so long that providing continuous shade would be difficult. Is it only being considered at major intersections.

JM: Concerned with the design of intersections, since this is where crashes will occur.

TS: Agrees that this is a major issue. There is a video ([Everyone Has a Story](#)), that DH has, which may be useful for the study teams to review. It explains the types of problems that arise at intersections. *Correct signage and striping is critical.*

RL: Agrees. *Once the typical section is determined, these issues will be reviewed.*

	<p>JB: <i>There will be relatively few intersections in the southern section.</i></p> <p>TS: Concerned with the ability for cyclists to activate signals, as well as being given enough time to cross intersections, especially crossing Krome Av.</p> <p>JB: <i>These issues will be taken into consideration.</i></p> <p>HB: Concerned with conflicts along the passing lane near intersections. New intersections will be developed that may not be taken into consideration.</p> <p>MC: The passing lane is actually another (southbound) lane. It is an alternative if the 4-lane typical section is deemed undesirable. <i>There will be access mgmt. points along these mile-long stretches.</i> However, some businesses may not have direct access.</p> <p>CS: Concerned with cyclists being blinded by automobile headlights. <i>Perhaps the bikeway could be higher than the travel lanes. Suggested the path be designed closer to the roadway at intersections so that motorists would be more likely to notice them.</i></p> <p>JB: <i>There will be swales in between the roadway and the paths.</i></p> <p>JM: Some cyclists will undoubtedly use the paved shoulders, as opposed to the paths. <i>Stressed the importance of avoiding placing any hazards, such as raised pavement markings, in this area.</i> Many cyclists traveling to/from Central Florida desire avoiding Miami's urbanized area, and will use this improved roadway. They will not use the paths.</p> <p>TS: There are a few trails within Florida that have made special accommodations at intersections to improve safety. <i>DH has more information that the study teams should consider.</i> For instance bollards and fences are used to limit access to the paths. ATVs will find it easier than trackers to do so. Maintenance and enforcement will become issues.</p> <p>JB: Referred to the design of the Overseas Heritage Trail as a possible example.</p> <p>ET: <i>Requested enhanced provisions at intersections; e.g., zebra-striped crossings.</i></p> <p>MC: <i>Public meetings are expected by September. The North project will most likely be presented at the Rinker facility at Kendall Dr. & Krome Av.</i></p> <p>JB: <i>The South project will most likely be presented around SW 288 St.</i></p> <p>TS: <i>Requested meeting notices to be sent to DH, who will forward to BPAC members.</i></p>
TRANSPORT- ATION ENHANCE- MENT PROGRAM APPLICATION REVIEW	<p>- TS: The Agenda pkg. has a list of all the projects under consideration. <i>Every CAC member ranks each project. All these rankings are combined for a final ranking.</i></p> <p>DH: The Crandon Blvd. application is from the Village of Key Biscayne, and is separate from the improvements which Mr. Cohen – MDPW has been mentioning at past meetings. <i>There is a TEP Review Committee, which also ranks these projects.</i> Nearly \$50 million has been programmed in the past 10 years. Although there have been implementation problems in the past, <i>many projects will be developed within the next few years.</i> MDP&R is very active now, and the Cities of Miami and Miami Beach are aggressively pursuing a share of funding.</p>
HOMESTEAD TRANSPORT- ATION PLAN	<p>- DH: The FDOT proposed bike lanes along Krome Av. leading to/within the Downtown Homestead area. The City didn't want the on-street parking to be removed.</p> <p>TS: The FDOT prepared a parking study supporting the removal.</p> <p>DH: The report indicated an abundance of under-utilized parking spaces. The compromise was for the City to conduct a <u>Downtown Transportation Plan</u>, which would also identify an alternative bike route. However, there is no guarantee that this route would ever be funded/implemented. Therefore, the BPAC should be voting whether the Krome Av. lanes should be provided; not which alternative they prefer. Last month, ET provided another alternative for the BPAC to review.</p> <p>TS: Stressed that there is no guarantee that any alternative would be funded, or the route/provisions would be acceptable to cyclists.</p>

	<p>DH: <i>Wanted to clarify that no bike facilities will be built in the 4-block historic section. However, they will be installed south of that through Florida City to US-1.</i></p> <p>TS: Inquired what happens if the BPAC votes to keep the bike lanes on Krome Av.</p> <p>DH: The FDOT will continue to the next phase of PD&E.</p> <p>SB: <i>Motion endorsing the continuance of bike lanes along Krome Av. as per the current FDOT design plans; seconded by JD.</i></p> <p>SB: Inquired if the concept is to route cyclists to Homestead or through it.</p> <p>TS: The facility should accommodate all travel to/from this area. Aside from the Homestead proposal, he hasn't seen any data conflicting with the FDOT proposal. The City's argument was that FDOT conducted the study during the wrong times. The BPAC made suggestions, (e.g., winter surveys, counting the amount of bicycle use/ownership in RV parks). He is under the impression these were not done.</p> <p>DH: Wanted to clarify, there is no guarantee that bike lanes will be developed in this area.</p> <p>TS: Inquired if the same problem could materialize as Grand Av., (wherein the City protested to the MPO against the MDPW recommendation for bike lanes).</p> <p>DH: Potentially, yes.</p> <p>TS: The City of Miami wanted wider sidewalks/landscaping to spur urban development. The ROW didn't support both bike lanes and the City's desire. The MPO waived the requirement for bicycle considerations, and noted this action was not setting precedent. He is concerned the MPO could make the same type of decision again.</p> <p>SK: Requested to call the motion.</p> <p>BPAC: <i>Vote – unanimous.</i></p>
LIVABLE COMMUNITIES WORKSHOP	<p>- DH: Members should consider attending this all-day workshop. It is an opportunity to learn about many issues from a compelling speaker. There is no charge and you can come an go as you like; however you must register.</p> <p>ET: Inquired if a Parks Dir. could be interested in attending.</p> <p>DH: Absolutely; encourage any governmental contact to attend.</p>
PUBLIC WORKS UPDATES	<p>- DRS: <i>Upgrading the Rickenbacker Bike Path will cost approx. \$180,000. The design is being reviewed by an electrical engineer for lighting. Within the next 2 weeks, the project should go out for bids. If nothing goes wrong, the process would take approx. 75 days before construction commences. This phase of the project is from Brickell Av. to the cross-over to the mangrove preserve, south of Bear Cut Bridge. The resurfacing project is on hold, due to a lack of funds. The bike project includes signage and striping.</i></p> <p>DH: <i>Reducing bulb-outs in cyclists way; modifying right-turn bays and intersections; and adding a ramp to access the Brickell Bike Path from the toll booth area; and improving the crossing area to the mangrove preserve is also included.</i></p> <p>TS: Inquired if steps are being taken to ensure bicycle safety during this construction.</p> <p>DRS: Now is the time to ask for such.</p> <p>TS: Unless it is done, something catastrophic could occur. Just recently, a person walking his bicycle was killed. The construction co. was sued, because they didn't follow the recommended precautions. Cones, markings and barriers could all help.</p> <p>DRS: <i>Will forward his concerns.</i> The contracts states that: "No work will be done, at all, on Sat. & Sun., or any day between the hours of 4-6pm and 10pm-9am." There are exceptions to those hours, if work is necessary to public safety.</p> <p>TS: Those hours may be the heaviest hours of bike use; but, cyclists are using this route all the time. <i>Debris and other hazards should be cleared from the temporary cyclists' route before workers leave for the day. Appropriate lighting and warning lights must be provided, because cyclists use this route long after sunset. Requested DRS to formalize</i></p>

		<p><i>these requests and forward them to the appropriate entities.</i></p> <p>DRS: In other matters, the GO Bond projects are coming forth, and there are many bikeway and sidewalk projects. The Commissioners will be approving projects in their respective districts, so this is the time to request assistance from them.</p>
JUNE REPORT	-	TS: Requested members to read the staff report.
MISCEL- LANEOUS	-	<p>◆ ET: He reviewed the proposed FDOT typical sections for NW 74 St. They claimed that, due to ROW constraints, bike lanes would be eliminated in the eastern-most section (1 mile). He revised the configuration to continue the bike lanes (and provided members with a diagram). DH has forwarded these revisions to the FDOT for their consideration. DH: Has not received a response; but, <i>will follow-up on this.</i></p> <p>◆ ET: He provided a list of suggestions for future meetings. <i>Maintenance is a concern.</i> TS: Maintenance has been formally discussed with MDPW previously; including: which agency is responsible; what work is being done; what machinery is available and should be acquired; as well as the BPAC's role in getting more funds for such. One concern was with a phantom sweeper that the MDP&R provided to MDPW, but they don't know where it is. Historically, the construction process doesn't consider maintenance. The recommendation from MDPW is to notify them of hazards, etc. Regarding cars or debris on paths, <i>this should be reported to Team Metro, or the local municipality.</i> Besides the subject of the complaint, <i>Team Metro will perform a thorough review of the area.</i> ET: The only wording he and the enforcement officer who assisted him could find states: "...must maintain the swale..." TS: Unfortunately, property owners get the violation, even if they are not responsible. SB: Sometimes there isn't any other place for residents to park their cars besides in front. TS: Regarding the update of maps, DH is performing this task. A final product is difficult, due to continued revisions/up-to-date field reviews. SB: Regarding the building of sidewalks, nearly every land owner has to provide such as the property is developed. If the land is not developed this requirement is not enforceable. ET: He is concerned with sidewalks that don't connect to the roadway; instead they curve around the corner. TS: This may be a code deficiency, rather than a developer's choice. SB: The MDPW could provide ET with information on what is required. TS: The BPAC cannot review each municipal code book and recommend changes. However, MDPW can be asked to bring forward those issues that may be concerns to bicyclists and pedestrians. Each member has the right to pursue these endeavors on their own as citizens; however, the BPAC is only an advisory committee to the MPO.</p> <p>◆ TB: Inquired if the Key Biscayne mangrove preserve path could be better connected to Rickenbacker Cswy. The guardrail is a concern; <i>the path should be reconfigured to go around the guardrail, so cyclists can access the Rickenbacker paved shoulder.</i> DH: This is not being planned; the guardrail will remain. However, <i>the connection to the path on the southern side will be improved.</i></p>

- The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.